DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 172 363 EA 011 769

AUTHOR Abel, William B.; Lynd, Albert
TITLE Collective Bargaining in Public School Education.
PUB DATE 78
NOTE 32p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrative Personnel; Administrator Role; Boards of Education; *Collective Bargaining; Elementary Secondary Education; *Professional Associations; Teacher Associations; Teachers

ABSTRACT

The exploration and writing in collective bargaining in education are sufficient to provide ample material for identification of issues and alternative strategies for resolving problems. Through a comprehensive examination of the literature the authors focus on the goals of organization and negotiations and the several functions served by collective bargaining. The research and literature are divided into several sections: (1) major studies; (2) historical development; (3) professional organizations at the state and national levels; (4) management: school boards and administrators; (5) labor: teachers; (6) public interest; and (7) educational implications. Included is a comprehensive bibliography. (Author)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED172363

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

W. Abel

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

COLLECTIVE BARGAINING IN PUBLIC SCHOOL EDUCATION

by

William B. Abel

and

Albert Lynd

EA 011 769

COLLECTIVE BARGAINING IN PUBLIC SCHOOL EDUCATION

Introduction

The dominant characteristic of a modern American society is change, a factor that no individual or institution can ignore. Change is vital to education, yet educational institutions resist change and are in trouble. Ironically, the major source of that trouble lies in its past successes; education and the public schools created to promote it became the major contributor to a new and radically different social dynamic, which is currently evolving in this country. The character of that dynamic threatens the nature of educational institutions. It is vital to education that these changes be analyzed and their implications determined.

During the latter half of the 19th century, teaching was a short lived occupation for the majority of American public school teachers. Many teachers spent only a few months in a classroom while for a larger portion of the year they turned to more economically secure labor in farming or industry. The popular concept of education and the small financial reward discouraged many young men and women from entering or making teaching their career. Those who did enter the profession remained financially handicapped or later sought employment elsewhere in order to afford to marry and raise a family (McAndrew, 1907).

In rural areas, the school teacher was often isolated and when conditions did not suit him he moved. As the cities developed and grew, the teaching force was more stable and salaries were higher; yet burgeoning enrollments and poor working conditions created other problems. With these forces prevailing, it was difficult to establish professional stability, or improve the professional and economic standards of employees in the public schools.

However, many changes have occurred over the past decade in the teaching profession; more men have entered the population, the average age of teachers has declined, more married women are engaged in teaching, and all of these changes have resulted in a teaching population much more sensitive to the environmental changes surrounding it. No longer are teachers willing to accept the typical salaries and benefits offered by conservative boards of education. No longer are they willing to accept sub-professional treatment.

Another factor contributing to the changing behavior of teachers has resulted from changes in the nature of teachers work. The past two decades have witnessed major strides in the reduction of small, inefficient school districts. Teachers no longer are as easily identified, nor are they subject to the subtle pressures of the community. The adoption of tenure laws to protect teachers from unprofessional school boards has also served as a strengthening factor in the negotiation of position of the teacher (Richards, 1960).

Once a school board begins to negotiate with a teacher organization and attempts to develop a mutually acceptable employment arrangement, it has already begun to surrender some of its flexibility. Boards find themselves bewildered when teachers are no longer automatically accepting the salaries and fringe benefits being offered to them. The board also finds itself in a position of being responsible for financing a public school system from tax receipts. As a result, boards of education find themselves representing a community very much concerned with operating educational systems at the lowest possible cost. Such a goal is obviously antagonistic to the goals of teachers seeking better salaries.

Collective negotiations in education serve several functions; first, it resolves economic conflict between teachers and boards of education over

the terms and conditions of employment. Second, it provides the teachers with a system of organizational government which protects their rights. Third, it provides an outlet for the satisfaction of the teachers psychological and sociological needs, which are present in the employment relationship. Fourth, it provides one of the strong institutional foundations of the private enterprise system.

The essential goal of organization and negotiation is the joint determination of policies and practices traditionally considered the unilateral responsibilities of boards of education and school administrators. The current form of the teacher drive for recognition through local organization represents a force on the educational scene. Teachers have sought professional recognition in part through organization. However, the drive for formal negotiating or bargaining privileges is new to education. Unlike earlier forms of teacher organization activity, the current emphasis on negotiation has its major input at the local level.

State teachers associations began to develop during the latter half of the 19th century so that by 1910 every state and territory, with the exception of Deleware and Tennessee, had a state association. Two organizations were formed to represent teachers on the national level-the National Education Association, established, and later in 1916, the American Federation of Teachers. The effect on teachers of the struggle and intensive rivalry between the National Education Association and the American Federation of Teachers has been extreme. The organizational rivalry between the two groups is perhaps the most important single factor underlying the rapid spread of collective negotiations.

Part II

The literature and research in the field of collective bargaining and teacher negotiation has been divided into seven sections; one, major studies,

two, historical development, three, professional organizations at the state and national level, four, management: school boards and administrators, five, labor: teachers, six, the public interest, and seven, the educational implications.

Major Studies

Accompanying the rapid spread of teacher-school board negotiations is a burgeoning of the literature about its causes and its impact on the educational system. It is common for even relatively new books on the subject to be robbed of currency by the rapid pace of events. Nevertheless, several books remain essential for an understanding of the current status of teacher power and for anticipating the patterns future events will take.

Michael Moskow's book Teachers and Unions, published in 1966, assesses the viability of collective bargaining in public education. His conclusion is that local level collective bargaining is viable for public education, and in fact has been used in some school districts. The structure and language of this book is essentially a skeleton for a much more comprehensive work published in the same year.

Moskow was joined by Myron Lieberman to produce Collective Negotiations for Teachers: An Approach to School Administration. These two authors stand out among authorities on teacher-school board negotiations. This book, a product of their collaboration in 1966, remains the definitive analysis of collective negotiations. Their treatment of the following major problem areas of collective negotiation is detailed and comprehensive: recognition of the professional staff by the school board, composition of the negotiation unit, administrative membership in the unit, representation and recognition procedures, bargaining power and impass procedures, and collective negotiation agreements. This work contains a detailed history of the collective negotia-

tion movement, and several nundred pages of appendix which include original text of virtually every important aspect of collective negotiations. Stinnett, Kleinmann, and Ware (1966) offer a well documented and scholarly explanation of the then current NEA policy on negotiations. Concentrating on the state level, they discussed probable causes of increased teacher restiveness, stressed the need for a new public policy to satisfy teacher demands, and summarized the past efforts of teachers to win concessions from school boards.

In 1966, Lieberman, Moskow, and Elam combined to examine a spectrum of issues and opinions involved in the negotiation process. Although dated, this collection provides an opportunity to compare current policies with those practiced between 1960 and 1965.

Doherty and Oberer (1967) concede that conclusions about collective bargaining in education at its early stage of trial and experimentation can only be tentative. Topics range from causes of the collective bargaining movement in public education, to the character of the teacher organizations behind this movement, and to the implications teacher bargaining has for the quality of the educational enterprise. Of greatest interest is the analysis of the legal questions raised by the movement and the recommendations for future legislation in this area.

Historical Development

The rapid expansion of collective bargaining by teachers during the 1960's has led to a proliferation in the literature on this subject. However, practically none of this literature has focused on the historical evolution of collective bargaining in public education.

None of the studies conducted furnishes the historical perspective that is accomplished by Lieberman and Moskow (1966). The authors present the most comprehensive and detailed history of the collective bargaining movement

appearing in any of the works reviewed. The authors trace the origins of collective bargaining to the American Federation of Teachers in 1916. This study concludes that the most significant development in collective bargaining for public employees occurred with the Presidential Executive Order 10988 in 1962. This order had the effect of stimulating state and local governments to proceed with development of collective bargaining techniques.

Much of the earlier research efforts concentrated on legal aspects of collective bargaining and the development of models for negotiation legislation. Hazzard (1966) described the legal status of collective bargaining between teachers and boards in the fifty states. He concluded that informal negotiations often become formalized by state laws.

Brooks, White, and Lutjeharms, working separately in 1968, developed models for collective negotiation legislation. Each recommended separate statutes for education apart from other public employees and advocated negotiations as the most satisfactory means of resolving conflicts.

A similar model for collective bargaining legislation was developed in the state of Minnesota by Mayer (1969).

Fletcher (1971), Skillett (1971), and Perazzo (1972) concluded from examining statutes in twenty-six states that there was no consensus relating to statutes concerning teachers or to employee classification and indicated that the right to strike should not be included in new legislation.

Professional Organizations At the State and National Level

A major characteristic of the movement for collective negotiations has been the organizational rivalry between the NEA and the AFT.

Clark (1966) concluded that where professional status is concerned, teachers and administrators tend to view membership in the NEA with higher esteem than they view membership in the AFT. The over six hundred partici-

pants in this study felt that the NEA was more concerned with raising professional standards for teachers and administrators, while the AFT was more concerned with raising teachers' salaries and obtaining better working conditions for teachers. Interestingly, the NEA members indicated they were more pleased with the teaching profession than were the AFT affiliated teachers.

Browder in a 1965 analysis of the structure and functioning of the AFT reported that the AFT's objectives tended to be heavily economic. He observed that the AFT exhibited both democratic and oligarchic characteristics in its operation, and its members were less militant than union literature would lead one to believe. His data supports the contention that when the union is attentive to the members in terms of salary and working conditions, the union member finds the structure and functioning of his organization satisfying to his expectations.

Moskow's 1966 study of twenty school districts revealed that both the NEA and AFT have evolved from positions of relative impotence to their present forceful sponsorship of collective agreements. Moskow concluded that teachers and boards discuss purely professional matters on a year-round basis rather than during the collective bargaining process.

A need for separate procedures for decision-making on educational policy and for decision-making on employment conditions was advocated by Boyan in 1966.

Doherty and Oberer (1967) agreed with the teacher organizations on the scope of negotiable issues. They favored permitting negotiations on any question of educational policy. Surveys by Wildman in 1966 and 1968, Salerno in 1967, and Salzman in 1968 support the conclusions that the widespread acceptance of teacher organizations was an outgrowth of a broad national movement of teachers to better their economic status and assure some formal voice in policy making in the schools.

The differences and similarities of the NEA and AFT were examined by Williams in 1969. He identified issues which unions address in their attempt to recruit members and attempted to determine if teachers really changed as the result of union affiliation.

Writing in a 1971 issue of the Industrial and Labor Relations Review, Pencavel contends that union membership is a capital asset to teachers. Membership in unions or associations renders services for which the member is obliged to pay certain costs. Thus membership becomes a capital asset.

In an effort to examine the reasons for union survival, O'Connor (1973) studied local teacher unions chartered by the AFT between 1916 and 1950. He found that local chapters survive longer in school systems where teachers feel they have some influence on policy.

Several researchers have compared the programs and services of the NEA and AFT. Yimtatu (1975) and Pierce (1976) examined the numerous services offered members and chapters by the two organizations. Both offer legal advice, consultants to boards concerning health and life insurance, and other support services. The two authors concluded that at the local level these two organizations may not have been as dissimilar as has been assumed. Pierce has suggested that the constraints and contingencies posed for school district governance by the existence and activities of a teachers' association affect district policy in subtle ways.

The preceding indicates that the two national teacher organizations have been the source of much concern. There has been, however, and continues to be, great ambiguities and subtleties of concept surrounding their purposes and goals. Yet they do exist and their assessment, however difficult, is of central importance to collective bargaining.

Management-School Boards and Administrators

One of the most complicated problems in collective bargaining is the delineation of the role of administrators in the overall process.

Superintendents themselves disagree markedly as to what their role in the negotiations process is or ought to be. This was the conclusion of a 1966 study by Scott of ninety-eight superintendents in school districts in the Midwest.

The superintendents of many school districts have tried to function both as advisors to the board and as leaders of the teaching staff. Stinnett, Kleinman, and Ware (1966) describe three alternative patterns for the participation of superintendents in the negotiating process: (1) they may refrain from taking any part; (2) they may act as the representative of the board; and (3) they may serve as a third party resource to boards and teachers. They uphold the desirability of the dual role as a third party resource to both the teachers and the board.

It is the opinion of Allen in 1966 that a clear definition of the role of the superintendent awaits a definition of the role of the teacher organizations in the school environment. Allen discusses several possible roles which the process of collective bargaining implies for the superintendent and concludes that his leadership will be as necessary in the bargaining process as it is in other issues related to school administration.

The view of many school boards, according to Wildman, is that they would prefer to have their policy-implementing administrative staff remain outside the rank and file organization. A greater threat to the traditional role of the board is perceived to lie in the all-inclusive bargaining unit approach.

The perceived role of the school superintendent in collective negotiations continues to be part of the study of the effects of teacher unionism in America.

The opinion that superintendents are more closely aligned with the school board during, prior to, and in future collective bargaining than they are with teachers was expressed by Shils and Taylor (1968).

Several researchers have concluded that school board presidents view the superintendent's role as a resource person to the board of education and not to the teachers (Conine, 1969; Wurster, 1970; and Shearin, 1970). However, Hays contends that in 1970 teachers viewed the superintendent's role as a dual approach to negotiations. He reports that prior to negotiations teachers want superintendents to serve as resource persons to them. In addition, during negotiation the superintendent is viewed as a fact-finder and as a mediator.

School district size and urban versus rural settings are other factors determining the role of the superintendent in the collective bargaining process. Skaggs, in 1971, concluded that large urban districts view the superintendent's role as being removed from negotiations. Knapp and Casello, in 1973, compared urban to rural settings and found that assistant superintendents and professional negotiators are the most frequent chief negotiators in large districts. In addition, they observed that the smaller the district the more personal the relationship is between teacher and superintendent during the negotiation process.

Much of the literature on teacher unionism in education considers collective bargaining and the decision-making authority and leadership roles of principals.

Principals felt that collective bargaining has and is affecting their decision-making authority, thus making it more difficult to fulfill their responsibilities (MacKnell, King, Hooks, and Bell, 1969).

Some observers have focused on the position of the principal in the negotiation process. In a 1969 study, Bell observed that principals feel that their interests are not protected during contract negotiations. Smith's (1970) survey of principals in secondary schools concluded that the principals view themselves as excluded from the collective bargaining process.

This lack of satisfactory representation of principals' interests was the subject of investigation by Day in 1970. He observed that principals feel they should be represented as a separate group during the negotiation process and be able to protect their interests. Several writers have observed that principals' interests would be best protected by an independent organization that is affiliated, during negotiations, with neither the board of education nor the teacher organization (Barber, 1970; Austin, 1970). These writers feel that the principals' agents should represent and protect the interests of principals and give them loyalties to principals exclusively.

The view of principals is that as a group they do not feel that collective bargaining is especially harmful. Yet they do have some serious questions, however, about the impact of collective bargaining on the role of the principal (Almo, 1974).

Boards of education traditionally enjoyed a wide range of prerogatives in managing schools. Teachers, however, have become increasingly restive with this relationship and have demanded a change in the status-quo.

Early writers were concerned with the attitudes of school boards to collective bargaining by teachers (Collins, 1969; Proescholdt, 1969) and developed handbooks for board members to use during the negotiation process.

Although negotiations were a new experience for most board memebers, they were sensitive to the primary items of salary and benefits requested by teachers and did feel that affiliation with the NEA or AFT affected the commitment by teachers to negotiate (Napolitano, 1969; Seamon, 1971)

Initially, teachers' contracts were concerned only with salary, fringe benefits, working conditions, and job security. However, school boards increasingly are aware that teachers are anxious to be involved in the management of the schools (Illuzzi, 1975).

The 1976 meeting of the National School Boards Association surveyed its participants and reported that board members felt communication between teachers and board members is poor in districts that have experienced strikes. Board members whose districts had not had strikes indicated that all parties in the negotiation process agree on the issues to be considered in bargaining prior to the start of negotiations.

Often the reason teachers want collective bargaining is far simpler than has heretofore been recognized by boards. Fay (1976) suggests that in De Jure collective bargaining agreements can be abrogated by the board without teachers having legal recourse.

In a speech before the 1976 meeting of the National School Boards Association, Lundberg stressed that the school board's negotiating team is all-important in the collective bargaining process. He suggested that board members not be part of the negotiating team, yet at the same time, the board must maintain control over its segment of the negotiations through preparing its own demands, establishing priorities, and by setting limits on length of negotiating sessions. Lundberg suggested that boards follow three phases in

the negotiating pocess: Planning--measuring demands in terms of costs and educational benefits; Probing--ascertaining the position of teachers' team; and Persuasion--reaching tentative agreements that will eventually be formalized in the contract.

Nolte, writing in the American School Board Journal (1976), reminds board members that a board cannot abrogate its responsibility to decide nor can it delegate that responsibility to others.

NSBA Policy on Negotiations

The response of the National School Boards Association to collective bargaining negotiations was immediate and generally negative. At its 1961 convention in Philadelphia, the Association stated its official position on collective negotiations:

> School boards should recognize the great contributions to overall planning that can come from the knowledge and experience of classroom teachers, administrators, and other professional personnel and give careful consideration to plans, suggestions, and recommendations of these professional people.
>
> School boards should also establish and use free channels of communication with all their personnel so that decisions affecting their interest and welfare may be made only after careful board consideration has been given to their views, recommendations, needs, and grievances.
>
> School boards, subject to the requirements of applicable law, should refrain from compromise agreements based on negotiation or collective bargaining, and should not resort to mediation or arbitration, nor yield to threats of reprisal on all matters affecting local public schools, including the welfare of all personnel. They should resist by all lawful means the enactment of laws which would compel them to surrender any part of their responsibility.

With only modification in phraseology, this position was reaffirmed by subsequent conventions. In response to NEA's more militant policy statement of 1962, the 1963 NSBA meeting adopted a resolution of total rejection. It said in part:

> The National School Boards Association is opposed to sanctions, boycott, strikes, or mandated mediation against school districts and does not consider them to be proper remedies for use in problem situations. The authority of the board of education is established by law and this authority may not be delegated to others.
>
> In addition, local boards should support their state school boards associations in opposing legislation which condones sanctions, boycotts, strikes, or mandated mediation against school districts. In the event such legislation or judicial decision exists, state school boards associations are urged to seek appropriate legal means to repeal or overrule them.

Basically, the objection of the school boards to negotiations centered on the premise that, unless state law provided otherwise, to enter into such activities would be an abdication of their legal responsibilities. This position was clearly stated in the first paragraph of the 1967 resolution passed at the Portland, Oregon NSBA convention. It said:

> The National School Boards Association believes that it is a fundamental principle of democracy that policy decisions are made only by those who are directly accountable to the electorate. It is the prime obligation of education to provide the opportunity for each student to achieve his greatest potential. These premises merge and coincide in the public school system, a government process and an education institution.

Notwithstanding the Association's rejection of some of the basic tenets of collective negotiations, it was apparent from the NSBA pronouncements that it was beginning to recognize the reality of negotiations in the public schools and that solutions must be found to make the negotiating process less disruptive to the educational scene (Illuzzi, 1975).

AASA Policy on Negotiations

The American Association of School Administrators, a powerful department within the NEA structure, has experienced some difficulty in enunciating a clear-cut policy position on collective negotiations. A reading of the Association's publications showed that while not totally rejecting negotiations the administrators had serious reservations about the implied threat of these processes to the legal authority of the board and to the role of the

superintendent. In its 1965 resolution entitled "Staff Relations," the AASA adopted much of the philosophy of professional negotiations when it said:

> We believe that teachers, school boards, and administrators are all committed to the advancement of public education and that the goals and interests of these groups are highly interrelated. We believe strongly that the development of school policies and programs and the solution of school problems can best be accomplished by these groups working in harmony and with respect for the roles of each. We believe that effective policy development involves important contributions by each group.
>
> We believe that evaluation in staff relations is to be welcomed. We commend careful study and the development of principles that should govern these relations and define the responsibilities of various groups while maintaining the integrity of each. We believe that shared responsibility for policy and program development is a professional concept requiring a unique professional approach. We maintain that the superintendent of schools has a unique responsibility to provide leadership in these matters.

From this statement, it was obvious that AASA construed the concept of negotiations rather broadly. The administrators saw substantial difference between bargaining over wages and hours and negotiating over matters of common interest in the educational context. Lieberman and Moskow saw the mixed pronouncements of the Association as a resultant of the concept of superintendent/teacher unity which is an "article of faith with most superintendents."

Because the 1965 NEA sanctions resolution tying sanctions to the code of ethics appeared to be directed at superintendents, there was a call by some administrators for AASA to withdraw from affiliation with NEA. However, by 1966 the Association in its publication School Administrators View Professional Negotiation had come round to a cautious endorsement of the use of sanctions. The AASA found that sanctions when applied on "a responsible, professional basis with ample warning, can be a powerful tool" for the resolution of serious educational problems; however, strikes were condemned as inappropriate under all circumstances. In early 1968 the AASA proclaimed that collective negotiations were here to stay and outlined procedures for engaging in effective negotiations.

In response to widespread need for assistance from its members, the American Association of School Administrators, in 1976, drafted a model for state collective bargaining legislation. The AASA contends that collective bargaining is an employee, not a management initiative. Yet they feel that legislation often contains elements that are clearly detrimental to good education and good management. The model presented hoped to alert the school management community to the most serious threats to good management and good education in public employee collective bargaining legislation sponsored or supported by public employee unions or other individuals or organizations. The model law is written to apply to all public employees, rather than just school employees, and to meet the circumstances that prevail in most states.

The National School Boards Association in its 1963 resolution on Teacher-Superintendent-Board Relations agreed that "the superintendent, as administrative officer of the board, can function as a channel and interpreter of teacher concerns to the board and the board responsibilities... to the teachers." In the same year the American Association of School Administrators published a position document accepting the duality of the superintendent's negotiations role. However, it did warn against incursions into the centrality of his role:

> We strongly urge that boards of education and professional groups insist upon the recognition of the role and responsibility of the superintendent. The association pledges to resist any effort to displace the superintendent and his authority in matters affecting the interest and welfare of school personnel.

Labor-Teachers

Society and teachers have experienced major changes in regard to perceptions and expectations held for and by teachers with regard to teacher collective action.

As the concept of teacher unionism began to grow in this country, the writings in this area were both explorative and descriptive in nature. One of the early major studies (Browder, 1965) explored the issue of the professional person and the union teacher. Other authors concerned themselves with the questions of need for teacher strikes, professional expectations of teachers from unions, and the long-range outcomes of collective bargaining covering to public education (Olsen, 1966; NEA Journal, 1966; Herbertson, 1966). They observed that teachers at this time were opposed to strikes for any reasons. Also, teachers expected the union to be concerned with matters of teacher welfare--salary, benefits, and working conditions, first and professional matters second.

Goergen and Keough (1967) suggest that teacher strikes fall into discernible patterns and that the issues and outcomes usually represent teacher self-interest. In addition, they feel that strikes by teachers cannot be predicted by any set of indices because each strike reflects the individual school district and its teachers.

Once the pattern and acceptance of collective bargaining by teachers was established, researchers no longer concerned themselves with the more professional and philosophical issues. The reasons, effects, and outcomes of negotiation become the primary areas of concern. Phelps (1970) found that teachers were most concerned with class size and salaries during negotiation sessions. Writing in the Industrial and Labor Relation Review, Drotning and Lipsky (1973) observed that salary was the major issue among New York state teachers. They found that salary benefits of collective negotiations have been pronounced and substantial at the local level.

Unionization, when correctly specified, has a substantial positive influence on teachers' salaries. This conclusion by Biard and Landon (1973) supports their thesis that the effect of unions is strong and significant.

However, this positive attitude toward salaries and collective bargaining is not shared by all writers. Gauvin (1973); Gerwin (1974); Keyek and Jarvie (1974); and Zuelke and Frottreich (1976) express the belief that there is a futility in collective bargaining over salaries at the local level. They express the need for statewide salary schedules rather than each district negotiating with teachers over salaries.

Chief spokesman for the AFT, Albert Shanker (1975) suggests that even in districts where collective bargaining is well established, teachers have almost no voice in decision making.

Collective bargaining has had the greatest effect at the regional level rather than at the district level. Bargaining does have a substantial and significant effect on teachers' salaries, yet teachers can be expected to seek more involvement in the decision-making process through collective bargaining (Chambers, 1973; Bounette, 1975; Farmer, 1976).

Public Interest

The public's attitude regarding the ability of organized teachers to extract more money from the community for the support of education and particularly for higher teacher salaries has been the source of recent comment and investigation.

Collective bargaining for teachers is felt to be in the public interest since it usually considers educational as well as teacher benefits, although strikes do bring resentment among parents (Lanigan, 1971). If anything happens to cause the public to become disenchanted with collective negotiation, overall support of public education will decrease. Conversely, whatever is done to increase support of negotiations may cause an increase in support for education (Leddy, 1975; Yeakey, 1975; Mitchell, 1976; Powell, 1976). The public has a right to know how its elected representatives are governing the

schools, including how effectively they are representing the public's interest in such an important area as collective bargaining. The public, if it understands the issues, will many times support the school board's positions (Folz, 1976; Nolte, 1976). The public has a right and responsibility to be well informed on how its schools are run; and community participation may eventually become a component of the collective bargaining process (Jackson, 1976).

Educational Implications

If collective negotiations are to bring about meaningful change in education, a need exists to analyze the implications of collective negotiations for the educational process.

Radebaugh (1966) observed that contract agreements usually contain ideas related to educational development but all too often only consider benefits. Laws should be passed that mandate educational considerations such as curriculum and class size to be included in all negotiated agreements.

It is necessary to determine what educational categories, if any, lend themselves most appropriately to negotiation and which are better handled by other processes (Bishop, 1967). The author questions whether if a curricular issue is negotiated successfully can it be maintained unless the support systems are also negotiated. He suggests that process, not programs, be more likely subjects for negotiation in curriculum and instruction.

It was the opinion of several writers that collective negotiations in which adversary positions are present are incompatible with achieving educational goals (Richards, 1971; Olsen, 1971; Ehrenhaft, 1972; Coulter, 1972). In addition, these writers consider collective negotiations to be a divisive agent in the curricular decision-making process and the educational profession.

However, other writers found a positive relationship between collective bargaining and the educational process. Leupp (1975) concluded that there were more instructional provisions in teacher contracts than at any other time in collective bargaining. This position is supported by research for the National School Boards Association. Thompson and Ziemer (1976) reported that while large school districts tend to include a greater number of instructional provisions than small districts, the increase was significantly higher in all districts across the nation.

Summary

The exploration and writings into collective bargaining in education is sufficient to provide ample material for identification of issues and alternative strategies for resolving these problems. The focus and intensity of examining collective bargaining has varied according to the concerns of the assessor. Two important reasons for concern over collective bargaining by teachers run throughout the literature.

First, the movement will expand at a continuing rapid rate, and negotiations will take place under a variety of procedures. The adoption of collective negotiation statutes by an increasing number of states should provide impetus for the movement.

The second reason for concern is the present and anticipated impact on the educational system.

In addition to the two problems facing all collective bargaining, inter-union competition will continue; a new balance of power must be achieved between teachers' representatives and the representatives of the public; and the concern for the influence on the schools by the public will continue.

Research has detailed that collective bargaining by teachers has achieved significant attention and with appropriate guidelines can be an important force for the improvement of American public education.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

Allen, Roy B., and Schmid, John, eds. Collective Negotiations and Educational Administration. Columbus, Ohio and Fayetteville, Arkansas: University Council for Educational Administration and College of Education, University of Arkansas, 1966.

Almack, John C., and Lang, Albert R. Problems of the Teaching Profession. New York: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1925.

Beale, Howard Kennedy. Are American Teachers Free? New York: C. Scribner's Sons, 1936.

Becker, Howard S. "The Nature of a Profession." Education for the Professions. Sixty-first Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part II. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1962.

Bishop, Leslie J. Collective Negotiations in Curriculum Instruction. Washington, D.C.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1967.

Chamberlin, Neil W., and Kuhn, James W. Collective Bargaining. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1965.

Doherty, Robert E., and Oberer, Walter E. Teachers, School Boards, and Collective Bargaining: A Changing of the Guard. Ithaca, N.Y.: New York State School of Industrial and Labor Relations, Cornell University, 1967.

Elam, Stanley M.; Lieberman, Myron; and Moskow, Michael H. Collective Negotiations in Public Education. Chicago: Rand McNally and Company, 1967.

Gerwin, Donald, ed. The Employment of Teachers: Some Analytical Views. Berkley, Calif.: McCutchen Publishing Corporation, 1974.

Keyek, Eugene J., and Jarvie, Dolores. Analysis--Negotiated Agreements 1974-75: Teacher Contracts. Trenton, N.J.: New Jersey School Boards Association, 1974.

Kruger, Daniel H., and Schmidt, Charles T., Jr. Collective Bargaining in the Public Service. New York: Random House, 1969.

Lieberman, Myron, and Moskow, Michael. Collective Negotiations for Teachers: An Approach to School Administration. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1966.

Loewenberg, Joseph J., and Moskow, Michael H. Collective Bargaining in Government. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1972.

Marten, Nicholas A.; Salisbury, Robert H.; and Eliot, Thomas H. State Politics and the Public Schools. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1964.

Moskow, Michael H. Teachers and Unions. Philadelphia: Industrial Research Unit, University of Pennsylvania Wharton School of Finance and Commerce, 1966.

Pierce, Douglas R. Teachers' Association Impacts Upon Governance of a School System. Portland, Oregon: Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory, 1976.

Shils, Edward B., and Whittier, C. Taylor. Teacher Administration and Collective Bargaining. New York: Thomas Y. Cromwell Company, 1968.

Stinnelt, T. M.; Kleinmann, Jack; and Ware, Martha L. Professional Negotiations in Public Education. New York: The McMillan Company, 1968.

Wildman, Wesley A. The Law and Collective Negotiations in Education, Volume II, Collective Action by Public School Teachers, Final Report. Chicago: University of Chicago, 1968.

_____. "The Nature and Dynamics of Teacher Organizations--School Administration Negotiating Activities and Their Impact on School Administrators." In Collective Negotiations in Education: A Review of Recent Literature. Edited by Stuart C. Smith. Santa Monica, Calif.: Systems Development Corporation, 1970.

Baird, Robert N., and Landon, John H. "The Effect of Collective Bargaining on the Public School Teachers Salaries." Industrial and Labor Relations Review 25 (April 1972): 410-16.

Barbush, Jack. "Bargaining for Professionals and Public Employees." American Teacher Magazine 43 (April 1959): 7.

Corwin, Ronald G. "The Development of an Instrument for Staff Conflicts in the Public Schools." U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education, Cooperative Research Project No. 2637, Ohio State University, 1966.

Fay, J. Michael. "Changing the Power Balance." The American Educational Research Association. San Francisco, California, April 1976.

Folz, Edna. An Informal Public: Its Rights to Information and Its Claim for Involvement in Influencing Management Decision-Making in Collective Bargaining. Washington, D.C.: Association of Educational Negotiations, 1976.

Frohreich, Lloyd E. "Collective Negotiations and Teachers' Salaries: Some Evidence from Wisconsin, 1975." Madison, University of Wisconsin, 1976.

Fultz, David A. "Eight Ways Superintendents Lose Their Jobs." The American School Boards Journal 164 (September 1976).

Goergen, Joseph H., and Keough, John J. Issues and Outcomes of Teachers' Strikes, 1955-65. Jamaica, N.Y.: St. John University, 1967.

Gregg, W. Downey with Carolyn Mullins. "Where School Boards Do Everything--Even Bargain--Is Public View." American School Board Journal 163 (1976): 31-35.

Jackson, Barbara. An Informed Public: Its Rights to Information and Its Claim for Involvement in Influencing Management Decision-Making in Collective Bargaining. Washington, D.C.: Association of Educational Negotiations, 1976.

Leddy, John H. "Public Participation in Negotiations." National Association of Secondary School Principals 59 (September 1975): 3-7.

Lipsky, David B., and Drotning, John E. "The Influence of Collective Bargaining on Teachers' Salaries in New York State." Industrial and Labor Relations Review 27 (October 1973): 18-35.

Lundberg, Larry. "Preparing for Negotiations." Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National School Boards Association. San Francisco, Calif., April 10-13, 1976.

McAndrew, William. "Where Education Breaks Down." Educational Review 33 (January 1907): 22.

Magruder, Donald R. "The Influence of 'Goldfish Bowl' Bargaining in Education." Presented at the Annual Convention of the AEN in New Orleans, Louisiana, April 2, 1976.

Mitchell, Douglas E. "The Impact of Collective Bargaining on Public and Client Interests in Education." Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association. San Francisco, California, April 19-23, 1976.

Moskow, Michael H. "Recent Legislation Affecting Collective Negotiations for Teachers." Phi Delta Kappan 46 (November 1965): 140.

Muir, J. Douglas. "The Tough New Teacher." In The Collective Dilemma: Negotiations in Education, p. 38. Edited by Patrick W. Carlton and Harold I. Goodwin. Worthington, Ohio: Charles A. Jones Publishing Company, 1969.

Nolte, M. Chester. "Citizen Power over Schools: How Much is Too Much?" American School Board Journal 163 (April 1976): 34-36.

Pencavel, John H. "Demand for Union Services: An Exercise." Industrial and Labor Relations Review 24 (January 1971): 180-90.

Powell, Edward M. "The Teachers' Right to Strike Versus the Students' Right to an Education." Paper presented at the Pennsylvania School Boards Association Forum. Hershey, Pennsylvania, May 6-7, 1976.

Radke, Fred A., Mrs. "The Real Significance of Collective Bargaining for Teachers." Labor Law Journal 15 (December 1964): 795.

Ross, Doris. "76 Update: Collective Bargaining in Education. A Legislator's Guide." Report No. 78. Education Commission of the States (Denver, Colorado), January 1976.

Shanker, Albert. "Why Teachers Are Angry." American School Board Journal 162 (January 1975): 23-26.

Smith, Stuart C. Collective Negotiations in Education, A Review of Recent Literature. Eugene: University of Oregon, 1968.

Stinnett, T. M. "Collective Bargaining, Sanctions, and Strikes." The Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary School Principals 48 (April 1964): 103.

Thompson, A. Gray, and Ziemer, Russell H. "Impact of Collective Bargaining on Curriculum-Instruction." National School Boards Associations Research Report. Evanston, Illinois: June 1976.

Wildman, Wesley A., and Perry, Charles R. "Group Conflict and School Organization: An Analysis and a Warning." Phi Delta Kappan 47 (January 1966): 244-51.

Documents

American Association of School Administrators. The School Administration and Negotiation. Washington, D.C.: The Association, 1968

_____. Resolutions, Platform, Constitution, ByLaws, Ethics. Washington, D.C.: The Association, 1965.

_____. AASA Model Public Employee Collective Bargaining Law. Washington, D.C.: The Association, 1976.

Boyan, Norman J. "The Emergent Role of the Teachers and the Authority Structure of the School." Paper presented at the 14th UCEA Career Development Seminar held at the University of Arkansas in April 1966.

Department of Classroom Teachers. The Sixth Yearbook: The Economic Welfare of Teachers. Washington, D.C.: Department of Classroom Teachers, 1931.

National Education Association. News. Washington, D.C.: Press, Radio, and Television Relations, The Association, October 13, 1969.

_____. Addresses and Proceedings. Washington, D.C.: The Association, 1960 through 1972 inclusive.

_____. Professional Negotiations: Selected Statements of School Board, Administration, Teacher Relationships. Revised edition. Washington, D.C.: The Association, 1965.

_____. "The Professional Way To Meet the Educational Crisis." NEA Journal 36 (February 1947): 47.

National Education Association Proceedings. Addresses and Proceedings. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1914.

National School Boards Association. "Resolution on Teacher-Superintendent-Board Relations." Adapted April 1963.

_____. "Beliefs and Policies." Adapted by NSBA Delegate Assembly, April 3-5, 1965.

"Teacher Opinion Poll; Should Teachers Strike?" National Education Association Journal 55 (May 1966): 54.

Unpublished Materials

Almo, Charles Duane. "The Reactions of Principals to the Effects of Collective Bargaining on the Decision Making Structure of Public Schools." Ph.D. dissertation, Northwestern University, 1974.

Austin, David Childers. "A Study of the Attitudes of Texas Public High School Principals Toward the Principal's Role in Collective Negotiation." Ed.D. dissertation, The University of Oklahoma, 1970.

Barber, William R. "A Study of the Anticipated Effect on the Function of the Elementary Principal Accompanying Collective Negotiations in the Kansas City, Missouri, Public Schools." Ed.D. dissertation, The University of Missouri, 1970.

Bell, Harry Hurlburt, Jr. "The Role of the High School Principal in Collective Negotiations as Perceived by Principals Whose School Systems Have Been Involved in the Process." Ed.D. dissertation, Indiana State University, 1969.

Bozen, Robert William. "Organizational Change: Emergence of the Urban Movement Within the National Education Association." Ed.D. dissertation, George Peabody College for Teachers, 1970.

Bonnette, David James. "A Snudy of the Relationship Between Teacher Perception of Their Participation in School System Decision-Making and Specified Outcomes of Collective Bargaining." Ph.D. dissertation, University of Michigan, 1975.

Brooks, Karl Francis. "A Model for Collective Negotiations Legislation for Utah." Ph.D. dissertation, University of Utah, 1968.

Browder, Lesley Hughes, Jr. "Teacher Unionism in America: A Description Analysis of the Structure, Force, and Membership of the American Federation of Teachers." Ed.D. dissertation, Cornell University, 1965.

Casello, Joseph Harris. "The Superintendent's Leadership Style as It Affects His Role in the Collective Negotiation Process." Ed.D. dissertation, Rutgers University, 1973.

Chambers, Jay G. "The Impact of Collective Negotiations for Teachers on Resource Allocation in Public School Districts." Ed.D. dissertation, Stanford University, 1975.

Clarke, James Earl. "The American Federation of Teachers: Origins and History from 1870 to 1952." Ph.D. dissertation, Cornell University, 1966.

Clarke, Robert Lee. "The Roles and Positions of the NEA and of the AFT in Collective Negotiations: Opinions of Teachers and School Administration of Five Selected School Districts in Illinois." Ph.D. dissertation, Southern Illinois University, 1965.

Collins, Mary Ann T. "An Analysis of Employer-Employee Relations Reported in Selected New Jersey School Districts Impact of Public Law 303 on Collective Negotiations for Teachers." Ed.D. dissertation, Rutgers University, The State University of New Jersey, 1969.

Conine, Dean Edward. "The Effect of Collective Negotiations on the Role of the Superintendent of Schools of Six Selected Colorado School Districts." Ed.D. dissertation, University of Northern Colorado, 1969.

Coulter, Robert William. "An Investigation of Collective Negotiations and Curriculum Development in Middle-Sized School Districts in Michigan." Ed.D. dissertation, Wayne State University, 1972.

Day, Robert Church. "Perceptions of the Utah Elementary School Principal's Role in Selected Areas of School Administration and Collective Negotiations." Ed.D. dissertation, Utah State University, 1970.

Ehrenhaft, George. "The Relationships of Collective Negotiation to Curricular Development and Instruction, A Case Study of Brookdale Middle School." Ed.D. dissertation, Columbia University, 1972.

Farmer, Michael Joseph. "The Relationship of Teachers' Job Satisfaction and Teachers' Job Dissatisfaction to Teachers' Union Attitudes." Ed.D. dissertation, New York University, 1976.

Fletcher, James Lodsdon. "The Judicial and Legislative History of Public School Employee Collective Bargaining in Illinois, 1921-1971." Ph.D. dissertation, Northwestern University, 1971.

Garver, George Gaglin. "A Study of the Relationship Between Selected Variables and the Attitudes of Public School Principals in Oakland County Michigan Concerning Collective Bargaining for Public School Teachers." Ed.D. dissertation, Michigan State University, 1967.

Gauvin, Donald Philip. "An Analysis of Teacher-School Board Collective Bargaining and the Minnesota Public Employment Labor Relations Act of 1971." Ed.D. dissertation, University of Minnesota, 1973.

Hartman, Frank H. "The Political Evolution of Public Act 379 of the 1965 Michigan Legislature." Ph.D. dissertation, University of Michigan, 1968.

Hatch, A. Bernard. "The Development of a Handbook for Collective Negotiations for School Board Members in the State of Indiana." Ed.D. dissertation, Indiana University, 1969.

Hayes, John Patrick. "An Analysis of Selected Illinois Collective Bargaining Agreements as Perceived by Superintendents, Representatives of Teacher Groups and Prominent Negotiators." Ph.D. dissertation, Loyola University of Chicago, 1970.

Hazzard, William Robert. "The Legal States of Collective Negotiations by Public School Teachers and Implications." Ph.D. dissertation, Northwestern University, 1966.

Herbertson, Jack Ray. "Teacher Negotiations as Perceived by Representatives of Teacher Groups, Superintendents, and School Board Presidents." Ed.D. dissertation, University of Northern Colorado, 1966.

Hooks, Alvin Ray. "A Study of the Relationship Between Collective Negotiations and the Activities of the Secondary School Principal." Ph.D. dissertation, The University of Michigan, 1969.

Illuzzi, Salvatore John. "A Content Analysis of School Board-Teacher Association Negotiated Contracts for 1968-69 Through 1974-75 in Selected School Districts in the Buffalo Region of New York State." Ph.D. dissertation, State University of New York at Buffalo, 1975.

King, James Carl. "Effects of Collective Negotiations Upon the Role of Selected Elementary School Principals in Ohio." Ed.D. dissertation, Indiana University, 1969.

Knapp, Rodger Karl. "The Perceived Role of the School Superintendent in Collective Negotiations as Viewed by Superintendents, Boards of Education, and Teaching Staffs." Ed.D. dissertation, West Virginia University, 1973.

Lanigan, Fred William. "Public's Attitudes Toward Teacher Collective Bargaining, A Comparison by Occupation and Income Level of Residents of St. Louis County, Missouri." Ph.D. dissertation, St. Louis University, 1971.

Lehman, Robert Hayes. "Collective Bargaining Under Michigan Statutes: A Case Study and Interaction Analysis of the Negotiations Between the Board of Education, Flint, Michigan, and The Flint Education Association." Ed.D. dissertation, Wayne State University, 1967.

Leupp, Richard Hugh. "Analysis of Relationships between Perceived Qualities of Education and Selected Organizational and Attitudinal Aspects of Teacher Negotiations." Ed.D. dissertation, University of Idaho, 1975.

Lutjeharms, Joseph Earl. "A Proposed Model for a Collective Negotiation Statute in Public Education." Ed.D. dissertation, University of Northern Colorado, 1968.

MacKnell, Thaddeus Eugene. "High School Principals' Attitude toward Unionism and Its Relationship to Their Degree of Dogmatism." Ed.D. dissertation, New York University, 1969.

Malafronte, Anthony F. "The History of the Dade County Classroom Teachers' Association in Its Collective Negotiation with the Dade County School Board: 1961-1974." Ed.D. dissertation, University of Miami, 1974.

Mayer, Robert Louis. "A Model for the Preparation Process Prior to Collective Negotiations in Minnesota School Systems." Ed.D. dissertation, University of Minnesota, 1969.

Napolitano, Helene Stark. "Attitudes of School Board Presidents and Teacher Organization Presidents in Public Education in the United States." Ph.D. dissertation, Fordham University, 1969.

Oatman, Jacqueline Jean. "A Study of Conflicts Expressed by a Selected Sample of Public School Education Concerning Involvement in Employee Negotiations." Ed.D. dissertation, Michigan State University, 1970.

Olsen, John Daniel. "Attitudes toward Collective Negotiations in Catholic Secondary Schools of Large Dioceses in the United States." Ph.D. dissertation, St. John's University, 1971.

Perazzo, George Joseph. "The Legal Aspects of Collective Negotiations for Teachers in Selected States, 1970." Ed.D. dissertation, Brigham Young University, 1972.

Phelps, James Luther. "Differences of Attitudes Toward Collective Bargaining." Ph.D. dissertation, University of Michigan, 1970.

Proescholdt, Paul Walter. "The Preparation Process for Collective Negotiations by Boards of Education in the Twin Cities Metropolitan Area." Ed.D. dissertation, University of Minnesota, 1969.

Richards, George Henry. "Collective Negotiations in Education: Implications for the Curriculum Decision-Making Process." Ed.D. dissertation, Michigan State University, 1971.

Radebaugh, Byron Frederick. "Democratic Values and Collective Negotiations Agreement." Ed.D. dissertation, University of Toledo, 1966.

Salerno, Michael Philip. "A Study of Various Aspects of Teacher Unionism in the United States." Ph.D. dissertation, University of Wyoming, 1967.

Salz, Arthur Eliot. "The Growth of Teacher Unionism in New York City, 1945-1962." Ed.D. dissertation, Columbia University, 1968.

Seamon, Harold Palmer. "Fact-Finding in the Resolution of Teacher Organization. School Board Impasse During Collective Negotiations with Particular Reference to New York State." Ed.D. dissertation, Columbia University, 1971.

Shearin, Forrest Greene. "Effect of the Collective Negotiations Movement in Public Education upon Public School Personnel Administration." Ed.D. dissertation, The American University, 1970.

Skaggs, Willie Dean. "The Effect of Collective Negotiation on the Activities of Central Office Administrators for Instruction in the State of Illinois Excluding the City of Chicago." Ph.D. dissertation, Southern Illinois University, 1971.

Skillett, Jack Dean. "An Analysis of Judicial Decisions and Statutory Enactments Pertaining to Collective Negotiations in the Public School." Ed.D. dissertation, Oklahoma State University, 1971.

Smith, Stanley Spencer. "Some Effects of Collective Negotiations on Principal--Staff Relations as Perceived by the Secondary School Principals in Illinois." Ed.D. dissertation, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 1970.

Starr, Warren Dean. "The Washington State Education Professional Negotiations Act of 1965." Doctoral dissertation, University of Idaho, 1968.

Steele, Marilyn H. "Has Collective Bargaining Contributed to Instructional Improvement in Michigan Schools?" Ph.D. dissertation, Michigan State University, 1969.

White, Ernest Cantral. "Collective Bargaining Agreements in the Public Schools, 1966-1968." Ed.D. dissertation, Indiana University, 1968.

Williams, Jack Edward. "The Unionism of Teachers." Ph.D. dissertation, The Ohio State University, 1969.

Wurster, Stanley Richard. "An Investigation of the Attitudes of School Board Presidents, Superintendents, Teacher Association Presidents, and Teachers Regarding Collective Negotiations Provisions in New Mexico." Ed.D. dissertation, New Mexico State University, 1970.

Yeakey, Carol Camp. "Teacher Unionism and Community Participation in Selected School Policy Issues." Ph.D. dissertation, Northwestern University, 1975.

Yimtatu, Zaudneh. "Attitudes toward Unionism in the American Teachers' Organizations in the 1960s and Their Implication for the Ethiopian Teachers' Organization." Ph.D. dissertation, University of Wisconsin, 1975.

Zuelke, Dennis Clarence. "The Relationship of Collective Bargaining Negotiations to Teacher Salaries in Wisconsin K-12 Public School Districts." Ph.D. dissertation, University of Wisconsin-Madison, 1975.